

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/053,667		KAWAKAMI, HIDEHIKO	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	NAMRATA BOVEJA		3622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NAMRATA BOVEJA. (3) _____.

(2) James Barlow, Registration No. 32,377. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05/05/08.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 24 and 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: Torii et al. Patent Number 5,761,308.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/NAMRATA BOVEJA/
Examiner, Art Unit 3622

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed the 112 rejections of claims 24 and 27. It was agreed that the previously made 112 rejections would likely be overcome by the Applicant's proposed amendments, however any amendments submitted by the Applicant's would need to be reviewed for additional 112 issues. As for claim 24, Applicant representative discussed modifying the claim to recite that content is divided into a plurality of sections. It was agreed that this wording is an improvement, but further search and consideration would be required by the Examiner. .